PAGE 04/06

JUN 1 3 2007

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

*Total of

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)
Approved for use through xx/xx/200x, OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Traderiark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Docket Number (Optional) PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the Application Number United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail OCT. 2,2003 in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] First Named Inventor Signature Typed or printed E. PIDO Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. I am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) attorney or agent of record. Registration number attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the Individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.S. Pstent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mall Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

forms are submitted.

06/13/2007 21:53 2486841243

JUN 1 3 2007

PAGE 05/06

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents on:

Date of signature and transmission

By William J. Clemens

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re	Application of: PETER SPIESS)	Group Art Unit: 3654
Sexial No.: 10/677,989)	Examiner: E. Pico
Filed: October 2, 2003)	Attorney Docket: 16565
For:	DOOR WITH SLIDING DOOR LEAF AND WITH GUIDE MEANS	·)	Confirmation No.: 9067

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Honorable Sir:

Review of the above-identified application is requested for the following reasons:

- 1. The Examiner rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steele U.S. Patent No. 3255807. The Examiner stated that Steel discloses a door comprising a door leaf 22 having an edge surface extending in a plane and guide elements 50, 52 extending generally perpendicular to the plane of the edge surface, and a guide surface 38 extending in a plane generally perpendicular to the plane of the edge surface. (Final Office Action, Page 2, Paragraph 3)
- 2. The Examiner failed to identify the edge surface of the Steele door leaf 22 to which he refers. However, Applicant's position is that the guide elements 50, 52 and the plane of the guide surface 38 extend parallel to all of the edge surfaces of the door leaf 22. See Applicant's Amendment filed December 22, 2006 at page 9.

16565

06/13/2007 21:53 2486841243 PAGE 06/06

3. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steele in view of McAulay Jr. U.S. Patent No. 3523390. The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the movable belt disclosed by Steele for contact with a generally vertical guide surface as taught by McAulay Jr. and mount the guide elements disclosed by Steele generally parallel to a vertical plane of the guide surface as taught by McAulay Jr. to facilitate the movement and guidance of the sliding door.

4. The Examiner failed to explain why one of ordinary skill in the art, when faced with a vertical guide surface, would be motivated to select the Steele door, remove the extruded trim 54 from the door, and rotate the track member 40 90°. The Steele door 20 carries its own track member so that it does not require specially constructed guideways in the threshold. Col. 1, Lines 22-27. Thus, Steele teaches away from the elevator door construction of McAulay Jr. that has an elongated groove 20 formed in the door sill 17. See Applicant's Amendment filed December 22, 2006 at pages 8-9.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Jemens, Reg. No. 26,855

(248) 960-2100

Fraser Clemens Martin & Miller LLC 28366 Kensington Lane Perrysburg, Ohio 43551-4163 419-874-1100 419-874-1130 (FAX)